

**REMARKS**

Claims 21-26 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claim 26 has been objected to for certain informalities. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the limitation "the transfer includes heating the surface of the roll-shaped embossing mother die to heat the processed resin layer" has unclear meaning. Applicants have amended Claim 26 in accordance with the Examiner's interpretation. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the limitation "a water-proof resin layer having a high glass transition temperature is interposed between the process resin layer and the moisture-proof film base", raises new matter, which is not supported in the specification. Applicants have elected to amend Claim 25 to change the recitation of "a water-proof resin layer" to "a support resin layer." This subject matter is described in the specification as filed, particularly with reference to page 21, line 13 to line 24 as well as

Figure 6. Accordingly, this rejection should be rendered moot. Therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph rejection against Claim 25.

Claims 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Examiner states that the respective limitations of "...portions of contact between the recesses are formed in a peak shaped transfer" and "...portions between the recesses are formed in a peaked shape" of Claims 21 and 22 have unclear meaning. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection of Claims 21 and 22, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have elected to amend Claims 21 and 22 in view of the Examiner's comments. The amendments are described in the specification as filed, particularly with reference to page 16, line 22 to line 28 as well as Figures 2 and 3. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection against Claims 21 and 22 and their respective dependent claims.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,163). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, independent Claim 22 has been amended to recite a method of forming a reflector attached to the outer surface of a glass substrate that further includes "reflecting the plurality of recesses of the process resin layer in the reflective film, and laminating the adhesive film and the glass substrate, in that order, upon the

reflective film.” Applicants submit that a minimum, Matsuda et al. fails to teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner asserts that the production process of the reflection type projection screen depicted in Figures 20-22 of Matsuda et al. discloses the method for forming a reflector called for by the present application. However, Matsuda et al. merely describes producing a “lens sheet” by supplying resin liquid 413 to fill each recess portion 415 of a rotary intaglio 405 and urging a support sheet 411 against the rotary intaglio by a press roll 406 such that the resin fills the recess portion 415 with the rotation of the rotary intaglio 405 (Col. 25, Lines 9-68). In other words, Matsuda et al. simply discloses the producing a lens sheet by forming resins that take the shape of a convexo-concave pattern of a master roll 405. Matsuda et al. is completely silent with regards to reflecting (i.e., incorporating) the plurality of recesses of the process resin layer in a reflective film laminated on the processed resin layer itself.

Furthermore, Matsuda et al. fails to mention the feature of “laminating the adhesive film and the glass substrate, in that order, upon the reflective film.” In fact, Matsuda et al. teaches away from the claimed feature by disclosing that “backing base materials, 402, 403, 404 with properties of diffusion and reflection of light are laminated on the non-lens surface of the lens sheet 401” (Col. 25, Lines 55-58).

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda et al. fails to anticipate independent Claim 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections against independent Claim 22 and its dependent claims be removed.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0030774). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that independent Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate similar features as discussed above in regards to independent Claim 22. Independent Claim 21, as amended, recites a reflector attached to an outer surface of a glass substrate having an adhesive layer, a reflective film, and a processed resin layer having a plurality of recesses where “the reflective film is disposed between the adhesive film and the processed resin layer such that the plurality of recesses of the processed resin layer is reflected in the reflective film and wherein the adhesive film and the glass substrate, in that order, are laminated, upon the reflective film.”

Independent Claim 21 has been further amended to clarify that “the recesses are formed in a spherical shape for reflection and randomly arranged, and contact portions between the recesses are formed in a peaked shape.” This subject matter is described in the specification as filed, particularly with reference to page 15, line 2 to line 26 and page 16, line 22 to line 28 as well as Figures 1 and 2 and Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Yoshi et al. does not teach or suggest these elements.

As mentioned above, the Examiner primarily relies on Yoshi et al. however, at a minimum, Yoshi et al. fails to teach or disclose that “the reflective film is disposed between the adhesive film and the processed resin layer such that the plurality of recesses of the processed resin layer is reflected in the reflective film and wherein the adhesive film and the glass substrate, in that order, are laminated upon the reflective

film.” Although Yoshi et al. discloses a reflector, Yoshi et al., at a minimum, fails to teach or suggest a configuration in accordance as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to modify Yoshi et al. to yield the claimed invention because Yoshi et al. teaches away from the recited reflector. Specifically, Yoshi et al. discloses a reflector having a configuration in which a resin base material 33 is provided directly upon a substrate 32 (Paragraph 0086). In contrast, as mentioned previously, the present invention calls for a configuration of in which the adhesive film is laminated on the reflective film, followed by the glass substrate. As such, Yoshi et al. teaches away from the claimed configuration.

Additionally, Yoshi et al. merely mentions that many concave portions are continuously formed so as to overlap with each other on a surface of the resin base material 33. Yoshi et al. is completely silent with regards to having contact portions between the recesses formed in a peaked shape as called for by the recited reflector.

Thus, Applicants believe independent Claim 21 patentability distinguishes over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 21 is patentably distinct from the references proposed by the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) against independent Claim 21 and its dependent claims be removed.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,305  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200